DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 724 CE 022 898

AUTHOR	Spooner, Kendrick I.
TITLE	Model BOE Block Program for Rural Schools. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Center for Education and Management, Inc., Kersey, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education, Denver.
PUB DATE	27 Jun 79
NOTE	78p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Core Curriculum; Curriculum Evaluation; Data Collection; *Demonstration Programs; Flexible Scheduling; Followup Studies; Individualized Programs; *Office Occupations Education; Performance Tests; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Rural Schools; Senior High Schools; Simulated Environment; Time Blocks
IDENTIFIERS	Colorado

ABSTRACT

A one-year evaluation was conducted of the Exemplary Business and Office Education (BOE) Program as implemented in seven rural Colorado schools. The individualized program featured a two-period block core curriculum with three or more optional areas of study. Evaluation objectives were to describe the exemplary projects in light of the curriculum/instruction model, describe positive and negative aspects from student, teacher, and administrator viewpoints, assess student performance, and develop a student and employer follow-up survey. The evaluation team identified a control group of students; developed testing and evaluation instruments and a finalized plan (which could be used the following year for summative evaluation of the BOE program); scheduled and carried out site visits to administer tests, interview participants and staff, and collect data; summarized the findings, including the results of the civil-service-like performance tests, performed t-tests, regression, and variance analysis on the data, compared these with control group scores, and wrote a final report. The team found that students and teachers liked the Block Format (two or more scheduled periods of instruction) for the flexibility it gave in combination with model office procedures, individaul Learning Activity Packets, and individualized plan of study, showing that such a program can be run successfully in small rural schools. However, the program did not affect students' performance significantly; only the seniors in key schools outperformed seniors in the control group. (The final report includes data analysis tables and twenty pages of evaluation and follow-up instruments.) (CP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178724

MODEL BOE BLOCK

PROGRAM FOR RURAL SCHOOLS

FINAL REPORT

Principal Investigator

Dr. Kendrick Spooner
Center for Education and
Management, Inc.

Evaluators

Dr. Caroll Dierks
Dr. Elsie Donnel

June 27, 1979

The research was sponsored by the Colorado Research Coordinating Unit of the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education. The researcher was encouraged to express his judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Colorado Research Coordinating Unit or the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 022 898

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is appropriate to acknowledge the Key schools and Control schools that made this evaluation possible:

Key Schools

UNC Laboratory School	Jeanne Lipman
Bennet	Cheryl Heinzerling
Akron	Kathy Parker
Elizabeth	Marilyn Clark
Arriba	Edna Schifterns
Basalt	Joan Troth
Summit County	Bob Bowers and Lana Clawson

Control Schools

Byers	Janelle Schelagel
Battle Mountain	Bob Jarnett
Eaton	Judy Robertson
Idaho Springs	Sheri Potter
Wiggins	Diana Pfieffer

Others that helped are: (SBCCOE)Supervisors for Business and Office Education and the RCU Supervisor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
History	1
Project Description	2
Evaluation Design	3
Questionnaire Development	5
Performance Test	8
ACTIVITIES	12
Site Visits	13
STUDENT FOLLOW-UP	15
Development of Procedures and Instruments	15
Recommendation for Follow-Up	16
ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE TEST	18
Introduction	18
ANALYSIS OF ON-SITE REVIEW	27
Quality of Instruction	27
Facilities	29
Core Components	30
Core Subjects	31
Optional Experience	32
Administrative Support	33
Learning Activity Packets	34
Individualized Instructions	35
Block Format	38
Concluding Comments	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT.)

	PAGE
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	41
Model Office	41
Equipment Available	41
Equipment Utilized	41
Inservice	44
Students' Thoughts	44
Scheduling Problems	44
Time Problems	44
Quality Instruction	45
Summary	45
APPENDIX A (INSTRUMENTS)	48

TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Matrix of Entry Level	9
Table 2	Analysis Civil Service-Like Test	10
Table 3	Description of Subjects	18
Table 4	Mean Test Scores/Career Option	19
Table 5	Mean Test Scores/Grade Level	20
Table 6	Correlation Matrix	21
Table 7	Beta and F Scores/Variables Test Score	24
Table 8	Summary Analysis of Test Scores	24
Table 9	Beta and F Scores/Typing Speed	25
Table 10	Summary Analysis of Typing Speed	25
Table 11	Summary Analysis of Typing Errors	26
Table 12	Review Learning Activity Packets	36
Table 13	Program Evaluation Summary	42
Table 14	Review of Program Characteristics	43

MODEL BOE BLOCK PROGRAM
FOR RURAL SCHOOLS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education, in an effort to more effectively serve students in rural areas of Colorado, developed a new delivery system for Business and Office Education (BOE), in conjunction with seven rural schools. The concept of this delivery system is the utilization of the block format (two or more scheduled periods of instruction) with a core curriculum. The combination provides a comprehensive program to train students for entry-level positions. Each student's program was to be tailored to fit the individual student's need.

History

In the spring of 1976, the idea of a model project for rural schools was conceived by Carol Vote, Jean Brady, and Dan Lucero. During the summer of 1976, Dan Lucero and Jean Brady worked with Marilyn Clark at the Elizabeth High School to initiate the program. The Elizabeth School Board and administration agreed to the program, and in September 1976, under the direction of Bill Barnes, State RCU Supervisor, the program was initiated.

After the first year it was determined that the other state exemplary projects should be included in the model project. These were the Shorthand Project at Denver, the Business Office Student

Services Project (BOSS) at Platte Valley, the Audio Response Project at Northglenn, and the Individualized Shorthand and Typing Projects at the UNC Laboratory School. All of the instructors from the individual projects were brought together in the spring of 1977 to form a task force to work with the second year of the project at Elizabeth and to determine key schools throughout the state where the needed project could be implemented. The task force met periodically throughout the second year to look at the block itself and to develop individualized materials. Each meeting resulted in modification of the original concept. The key schools were selected and the program was implemented in September of 1978. Each school was provided with a $1,000 incentive grant to help support the additional cost to be incurred in the developmental process. The instructors of the key schools (this is the term used to describe the schools implementing the new program), met three times to exchange ideas and share problems about their programs and to develop more Learning Activity Packets (LAPS).

The size of schools in the study ranged from 61 students, K-12 to 1240 students, K-12; and have Business and Office Programs requiring the service of a part-time assignment for a BOE teacher to two full-time BOE teachers. All schools involved in the development of the key school model program were volunteers and worked closely with the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education (SBCCOE) to adapt the principal component of the key school model.

Project Description

The project had as its major purposes to implement a program that 1) provided scheduling with a minimum of two regularly scheduled class

periods or a combination of modules that are equivalent to a minimum of two conventional class periods, 2) provided a cluster approach with a core curriculum of related units and optional units in areas of specialized instruction, and 3) met all standard quality indicators, i.e., Advisory Committees and FBLA Organization. The program was to meet the training needs for students wishing to pursue accounting, secretarial, or clerical occupations.

The program has nine essential characteristics: two period block core curriculum, three or more optional areas of study, student management system, individualized/independent instructional delivery, model office, simulation and/or cooperative experiences, student career planning, facilities and equipment, and administrative support. Each of these characteristics will be further defined in Chapter IV.

The schools involved in the implementation and evaluation of the program were: UNC Laboratory, Bennett, Akron, Elizabeth, Arriba, Basalt and Summit County.

Evaluation Design

The SBCCOE funded a one-year evaluation of the Exemplary Business and Office Program. The objectives of the evaluation were to:

1) Describe the exemplary projects in light of the curriculum/instruction model.

2) Describe the positive and negative aspects of the curriculum as seen by students, teachers and administrators.

3) Assess the performance of the students in the program.

4) Develop a student and an employer follow-up survey.

The basic strategy for evaluation was on-site visits by business and office teacher educators, and a program evaluator. Data was collected using interview schedules (Appendix A) and performance tests.

The remainder of this section will describe the evaluation design and process.

The strategy for evaluating the program was to perform on-site visits at the seven key (experimental) schools. The evaluation team developed materials and facilities. The students were tested using a Civil Service-like examination. Administrators, faculty, and students were interviewed.

A control group of students in BOE programs, similar in size and location, was tested to provide a bench mark for making judgments about student performance. All interviews and performance testing were completed in a one-day visit in late March or early April. Each site visit consisted of:

1) Review of program Business Clerical Program-A Rural Model (key school) project, checklist (developed earlier).

2) Interview of teacher(s) involved directly with the project at each site.

3) Interview a sample of approximately ten students who were enrolled in the program.

4) Interview building administrator.

5) Performance test vocational students using a Civil Service-like test

A sample of students from selected comparision schools were tested using the same performance test administered to students from "key school" programs. The difference between group scores (block and traditional) was analyzed using a regression analysis and t-test for significant differences.

Analysis of the relationships of performance test scores to other classification variables was completed using correlation analysis. The control schools used were Wiggins, Byers, Eaton, Idaho Springs and

Battle Mountain Schools. These schools are approximately the same size and in the same regions as the key schools.

Questionnaire Development

Seven instruments were developed:

1) Teacher Interview Schedule

2) Student Interview Schedule

3) Administration Interview Schedule

4) Program Review Checklist

5) Employer Questionnaire

6) Graduate Follow-up Questionnaire

7) Student Data Matrix

Appendix A includes the instruments used in the evaluation. The instruments for the evaluation were specifically developed by the project staff to ensure their compatability to project intents. As part of the developmental process, the program supervisor of BOE and the RCU directors were given opportunity to review and approve each instrument.

The following list of questions was used to define the content of the instruments:

A. Physical surrounding and equipment/supplies:

1) Enough equipment available so individuals don't have to wait to complete an assignment?

2) Practice on equipment is of sufficient duration to insure proficiency?

3) Sufficient work space and storage areas for students'materials?

4) Supplies and necessary forms readily available and accessible?

5) Reference materials in the room?

6) Is it an office-like atmosphere?

7) Is there laboratory time available to students?

B. Instruction sheets or LAPS:

1) Are there adequate instructions given so students can proceed on an individual basis?

2) Are instructional and performance ojectives stated with minimum level of performance cited?

3) Are pre-tests included?

4) Does each LAP include a variety of learning activities? Logical sequence?

5) Are there short self-tests included?

6) Does the post-test reflect the stated performance objectives?

7) Do the LAPS have recycling activities built in?

8) Do the LAPS apply to the total program?

C. Evaluation:

1) What kinds of questions are asked? (objective/subjective)

2) Is job performance tested?

3) Are checklists or rating scales used?

4) What are students' attitudes toward work?

5) Are there types of formal test (teacher made, standardized, norm or criterion referenced)?

6) Are there grading-mailability and/or performance standards?

D. Administrative Support:

1) Impact on scheduling?

2) Availability of teacher aide?

3) Teacher-student ratio? (compared to traditional VOC-BOE classes)

4) Flexibility of teacher to be involved with other phases of VOC program (e.g., advisement, inservice, student organization)?

5) Are materials/supplies comparable to other vocational business classes of similar nature?

6) Does the program affect discipline for students?

7) Do substitute teachers have difficulty handling the programs?

8) Is release time provided to develop materials for programs?

9) Are there attendance problems?

E. Student formed questions:

1) Do peer assist with instruction and evaulation?

2) Does the block format allow the instructor time for individualized instruction?

3) Do students have to wait for LAPS, tests, and availability of equipment?

4) Are students able to progress at an independent rate?

5) Are the students' career objectives being met?

6) Do students fully understand instructions, activities and evaluation procedures?

7) Do students like to work independently?

8) Do students know where they stand in terms of grades and skill development?

9) Can students transfer knowledge learned through LAPS to other skill areas?

10) Do LAPS make the student more efficient?

11) What type of management system is used to pace student progress?

12) Are the LAPS self-contained?

13) Are students committed to their vocational program?

Performance Test

The performance test addressed the clerical occupations. The test developed was patterned after the State Civil Services entry level examinations.

The specific question addressed through the performance test was, "Is there a significant difference in the performance of students in the Block Program as compared to students in a traditional program for job entry level position?".

All testing was done during the site visit and took approximately one hour. In developing the written test, two studies were used to define the content of the examination: The task analysis recently completed by the SBCCOE[1] and the Colorado State Civil Service tests specifications.

Table One provides a description of the relationship between the research completed by the State Civil Service Research and Development Team, and the SBCCOE task analysis.

[1] Lewis and Oshima, Office Clerical Employee: Performance Objectives Curriculum Materials Service, Department of Vocational Education, Colorado State University.

TABLE 1

MATRIX OF ENTRY LEVEL
CIVIL SERVICE JOB SPECIFICATION BY
SBCCOE TASK ANALYSIS COMPENTENCIES

	-SBCCOE Task-										
Civil Service Job Specifications	Typewriter	Comm. With Others	Telephone	Mail	Reprod. Material	Control Docmt.	Operate Off. Mach.	Bus. Math	Bus. Lang.	Adapt to Bus. Envir.	Promote Personal Growth
Arithmetic								X			
Office Practice			X	X		X					
Oral and Written Instructions		X	X	X		X			X	X	
Proofreading											
Human Relations		X								X	X
Operate Equipment	X				X		X				

Table two provides the item analysis of items used in the performance test. The K-R-20 reliability coefficient was 0.61. Face validity was established by having the test reviewed by the BOE state supervisors and BOE teacher educators at the University of Northern Colorado. As part of the performance test, the students were given two,five minute straight copy typing tests,with a syllabic intensity of 1.50, an average word length of 5.6, and a high frequency of words at 80%.

Activities

The following provides an outline of the activities completed for the evaluation.

TABLE 2

ITEM ANALYSIS FOR CIVIL SERVICE-LIKE TEST

ITEM	CATEGORY	PERCENT PASSING	RESPONSES					KEY
			1	2	3	4	5	
1	Grammar	85.1%	4	12	103	2	0	(3)
2	Grammar	81.0%	4	98	5	14	0	(2)
3	Grammar	92.6%	1	6	112	2	0	(3)
4	Grammar	66.1%	80	1	5	34	0	(1)
5	Grammar	36.4%	17	51	44	9	0	(3)
6	Grammar	30.6%	37	16	9	56	0	(1)
7	Grammar	37.2%	68	45	2	5	0	(2)
8	Grammar	62.8%	10	24	10	76	0	(4)
9	Grammar	28.9%	30	14	40	35	0	(4)
10	Grammar	41.3%	50	17	24	27	1	(1)
11	Proofreading	64.5%	21	78	0	22	0	(2)
12	Proofreading	56.2%	14	18	68	21	0	(3)
13	Proofreading	28.1%	32	1	34	54	0	(3)
14	Proofreading	66.1%	80	18	2	20	0	(1)
15	Proofreading	58.7%	25	5	71	18	1	(3)
16	Math	79.3%	5	12	7	96	1	(4)
17	Math	52.1%	41	63	9	7	1	(2)
18	Math	36.4%	25	44	28	21	1	(2)
19	Math	38.0%	17	38	46	19	0	(3)
20	Math	81.0%	7	6	98	10	0	(3)
21	Proofreading	84.3%	102	12	4	3	0	(1)
22	Proofreading	75.2%	91	19	9	2	0	(1)
23	Proofreading	58.7%	10	31	71	9	0	(3)
24	Filing	91.7%	0	3	6	111	0	(4)
25	Filing	95.9%	3	0	116	2	0	(3)
26	Business Form	27.3%	50	32	33	6	0	(3)
27	Filing	44.6%	30	54	5	32	0	(2)
28	Mail Handling	7.4%	76	9	27	9	0	(2)
29	Telephone	66.9%	81	15	21	4	0	(1)
30	References	53.7%	35	15	65	6	0	(3)
31	Office Machines	82.6%	14	100	5	2	0	(2)
32	Business Form	24.0%	45	29	23	22	1	(2)
33	Business Form	95.0%	115	3	1	2	0	(1)

TABLE 2 (cont.)

ITEM	CATEGORY	PERCENT PASSING	RESPONSES					KEY
			1	2	3	4	5	
34	Office Procedure	44.6%	21	23	23	54	0	(4)
35	Telephone	95.0%	2	115	2	2	0	(2)
36	Telephone	41.3%	19	9	41	50	1	(4)
37	Telephone	27.3%	68	15	5	33	0	(4)
38	Mail	41.3%	50	20	31	18	1	(1)
39	Mail	14.9%	75	25	18	3	0	(3)
40	Human Relations	63.6%	44	77	0	0	0	(2)
41	Human Relations	36.4%	44	2	2	73	0	(1)
42	Business Form	10.7%	49	13	53	6	0	(2)
43	Human Relations	92.6%	0	112	0	8	0	(2)
44	Human Relations	52.1%	5	52	63	0	0	(3)
45	Human Relations	45.5%	55	2	61	2	0	(1)

ACTIVITIES

Objective	Activities
Finalize Evaluation Plan	Met with task force and with state Staff.
	Revised proposal.
	Executed proposal.
Develop Instruments	Reviewed task analysis; visited with State Civil Service Staff.
	Developed performance test.
	Developed student data form.
	State Staff reviewed data form.
	a) developed draft copies of teacher interview schedule
	b) student interview schedule
	c) administrator interview schedule
	d) employer follow-up instrument
	e) graduate follow-up instrument
Schedule site visits	Established final dates.
	Developed and mailed pre-site visit information to each school.
	Scheduled motel and transportation as needed.
Make site visits	Visited each key school as scheduled.
	Selected contol schools.

Objectives	Activities
Make site visits	Scheduled testing for control school.
	Tested control school students.
	Completed initial data analysis.
	Wrote draft report.
	Summarized the findings of each key school site visit.
Report written	Wrote interview progress reports.
	Completed final analysis.
	Wrote final report.
	Wrote summary report.
	Delivered oral report at CVA.

Site Visits

The following schedule was followed for the evaluation site visits:

SCHOOL	DATE	EVALUATORS
Elizabeth	March 20	Spooner/Dierks
Basalt	March 22	Spooner/Donnel
Summit	March 26	Spooner/Donnel
Bennett	March 27	Spooner/Dierks
Arraba	March 28	Spooner/Dierks
Akron	March 29	Spooner/Donnel
UNC Lab School	April 4	Spooner/Donnel
Cripple Creek	April 5	Dierks

Each school's teacher(s) were sent a student data form to be completed prior to the site visit. At each visit the evaluation team interviewed approximately ten or more BOE vocational students, the building principal and the teacher(s), (the forms used are in appendix A).

The evaluators also evaluated the equipment, facilities and materials used in providing instruction analysis. The evaluator met with the teacher for an exit interview. At this time the students' comments were summarized.

CHAPTER II

Student Follow-up

Development of Procedures and Instruments

Another purpose of the evaluation was to develop a student follow-up system to be used next year in a summative evaluation of the Business and Office Key School Program. This process is to be used by the State BOE Staff in conjunction with the teachers in the key schools. The following is the process used in developing the instruments and procedures recommended for use next year in completing the follow-up study.

Two instruments were developed through the use of an Advisory Committee made up of the RCU Director, Business and Office Teacher Education Consultants, and State Supervisors for Business and Office Education. Additionally, the instruments were reviewed by teachers in the Key School Program during the site visits. The researcher asked the teachers to provide him with any comments or questions concerning the instruments. Several teachers were provided enough instruments to pilot test.

Once the instruments were finalized, the researcher sent out the student questionnaire to ten graduates of Key School Programs. There was no attempt to follow-up after the first mailing. Of the ten instruments mailed, six were returned completed. Also, ten surveys were sent to employers of the graduates. Of these, five were returned, four completed and one with a note stating that it was against company policy to complete questionnaires concerning the evaluation of the company's employees. Again no follow-up attempt was made.

The results of the questionnaires were shown to the two teacher education consultants, the RCU Director, and the Business and Office State Supervisors. The instruments were critiqued for clarity of responses and comments related to the instruments' questions. The reseacher and the review committee disregarded the content of the surveys, in that the information was 1)confidential in nature and should not be published, and 2)represented such a small percent of the total sample of graduates that it could not be generalized across schools. This however, was not a problem because the only purpose for mailing the instruments this year was to pilot test for their content and clarity.

Recommendation for Follow-up

The researcher sees the need to develop a systematic process for identifying graduates and employers. It is important to address the problem of locating graduates as early as possible. One suggestion is to collect student addresses first, prior to graduation. In future years the teacher should ask the students to keep in touch by providing them with a postcard or some other means for communicating their new addresses.

The following steps are recommended for implementing the student follow-up survey:

1. Identify last year's graduates as soon as possible. Seek out the student's current address and contact the student concerning his/her employer.
2. List the graduates and type mailing labels for each graduate.
3. Code the questionnaries so that the teacher can identify who has returned the questionnaires. This can be done by coding the return envelope with a number or putting a number on the questionnaire itself.

4. Send graduate follow-up questionnaries (Appendix A) and a return, stamped,addressed envelope along with a personalized letter to each graduate. This first mailing should take place the last of January or the first of February.

5. Follow-up those students that have not responded to the questionnaire.

6. Once each teacher receives the returned questionnaire, type off the employer's name and code it to the student's name. This can be done by assigning the employer the same number that you assigned the student. Mail the employer a questionnaire (Appendix A), self-addressed, stamped envelope, and personalized letter. Be sure to code the employer's questionnaire or the return envelope so the responses can be identified easily.

7. Send out a third follow-up letter to all graduates that have not responded to the questionnaire after eight weeks. This follow-up letter should not contain a new instrument or a self-addressed envelope.

8. Send a follow-up letter to all employers that have not responded to the initial questionnaire. The follow-ups should take place approximately three to four weeks after the initial mailing.

9. Code information from the follow-up questionnaires onto coding sheets or tally the information to generate averages, percentages. and other descriptive statistics. Another suggestionfor analysis is to compare the student and the employer's responses on the core components listed in each questionnaire. One could do correlation analysis between the two sets of responses.

In summary the suggested student follow-up system, if utilized, should provide the teachers and the State Supervisors with information concerning the adequacy of the new curriculum in meeting the needs of the graduate's current job. With this information modifications can be made in the curriculum if weaknesses are identified.

ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE TEST

CHAPTER III

INTRODUCTION

As part of the key school evaluation, a controlled study was conducted testing for typing skills in terms of typing speed and typing errors, and cognitive knowledge pertaining to the clerical occupations. A 45 question Civil Service-like examination was given to the students in several key schools, and students in five control schools were selected on the basis of their size and characteristics. Description and analyses of the Civil Service test are provided in Chapter II. Table Three provides a general description of the students in the key schools and the control schools by grade, sex, and career objective. It can be seen that the types of students are similar, except for the distribution of control school student by grade. It is apparent that there is a higher proportion of seniors in the control schools than in the key schools. This has a definite effect on the results of the analyses, in that grade appeared to be a key factor in both the test scores and the typing speed scores.

TABLE 3

DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS

	Grade			Sex		Career Ojective	
	10	11	12	M	F	BOE	OTHER
Key School	1	36	35	3	72	61	11
Control	2	2	21	0	44	21	1

Table Four provides some descriptive statistics in terms of average test score, typing score, and typing errors by the key schools and control schools for students with BOE or other career objectives. The students with BOE objectives appeared to do better on the written test than did the students with other career objectives. The typing speed of students with BOE career objectives are slightly less than those of students with other objectives; however, the number of typing errors are lower for key school students with BOE objectives, than they are for students in the key schools with other objectives. Conversely, in the control group, BOE students had higher error rates than did the students with other career objectives.

TABLE 4

MEAN TEST SCORES, TYPING SCORES
AND TYPING ERRORS BY CAREER OPTION AND GROUP

Group	Career Option	No.	Average Test Score	Average Typing Score	Average Typing Errors
Key School	BOE	61	25.6	49.6	11.9
	Other	11	25.8	50.0	13.8
Total					
Control	BOE	21	26.2	47.1	15.2
	Other	4	21.5	49.5	14.0
Total					

Table Five provides a further analysis by grade level for each test score. It is apparent that for key schools, the seniors did better on the written test and had much higher typing speed; however, they did make more errors. In the control schools, seniors had higher typing speed and fewer errors but did not score as well as the juniors on the written examination. In general, the students in the key schools had higher scores on the written test and speed test than did the students in the control group, and further, the key school students had fewer typing errors than did the students in the control group.

TABLE 5

MEAN TEST SCORE
TYPING SCORE AND TYPING ERRORS
BY GRADE LEVEL BY GROUP

Group	Grade	Average Test Score	Average Typing Score	Average Typing Errors
Key School	12	26.2	54.5 wpm	12.8
	11	24.7	45.9 wpm	11.7
	10	23.0	40.0 wpm	8.0
Average			50.0 wpm	12.2
Control	12	25.8	48.0 wpm	15.2
	11	26.0	40.0 wpm	16.5
	10	20.1	45.5 wpm	15.5
Average			47.2 wpm	15.3

Table Six provides a correlation matrix that shows the relationship between some of the major variables in the study. Some of the significant correlations are between grade and the number of semesters of Accounting, typing speed of students, typing scores and test scores, and between typing scores and the number of semesters of Shorthand. The regression analysis that follows, shows that these relationships are major contributors to the criterion variables. The analysis of the three variables--test score, typing speed, and typing errors--was accomplished in two levels. First, all independent variables were included in a regression model which generated a master correlation matrix. From this initial analysis the variables that had the greatest potential for contributing to the criterion variables were taken and set into a second regression model.

TABLE 6

CORRELATION MATRIX

	Grade	Sex	Semester Shorthand	Semester Typing	Semester Accounting	Test Scores	Typing WPM	Typing Errors
Group	-.22	.11	-.05	.14	-.07	-.01	-.11	.18
Grade		-.07	-.14	.05	-.35	-.22	-.31	-.09
Test Score			.11	-.01	.12	1.0	.41	-.05
Typing Score			.39	-.05	.28	.41	1.0	-.27

Table Seven indicates the variables that contribute most to explaining the variability in test scores. Factors that appear to contribute significantly to test scores are grade, sex of student, and a career objective other than Business and Office Education.

Table Eight provides a summary of the analysis of variance. The combination of the four variables previously discussed in Table Seven contribute significantly to test scores at the .01 level. Based upon the mean scores provided earlier, it can be interpreted that seniors, in general, did better on the written test than did juniors and sophomores. Also, students with career objectives other than Business and Office Education appeared to do worse on the test than did students with BOE career objectives.

The second analysis (Table Nine) deals with the typing speed score. Variables that contribute significantly to this score were grade, number of semesters of shorthand, and school. The major contributor was the number of semesters of shorthand. There were two schools that made significant contributions to explaining the variability in typing scores. Grade level also made some contribution to explaining the variability in typing scores. The key school seniors significantly out preferred the control school seniors ($t=2.49$, $df54$)

Table Ten presents the summary table for the analysis of typing speed (wpm). The three variables mentioned above are significant at the .01 level. An analysis of the data indicated that none of the independent variables made significant contribution to explaining the

variance in the number of typing errors. Table 11 presents the summary table for the analysis of the variable typing errors with the variables that had the greatest promise for showing significance. There was one school that had a much lower error score than the others; however, the scores did not prove to be significantly different.

In the analysis, groups were used as the independent variable for all three criterion variables. At no time was there a significant difference on any of the criterion variables between the groups. Therefore, the conclusion must be that the Key School Program, in general, has not affected students' performance to any greater or lesser extent than the more traditional Control School Program. However, the seniors in the key schools did out-perform the seniors in the control schools. The influence of grade level on scores is predictable; however, the influence of shorthand on typing speed cannot be completely explained. Some thoughts are that those students who take shorthand are probably the better Business and Office students, and consequently have better typing speed, or that shorthand students in the process of transcribing their notes have typing skills reinforced.

TABLE 7

BETA AND F SCORES FOR VARIABLES
CONTRIBUTING TO TEST SCORES

Variable	BETA	F
Grade	-0.258	6.66
Sex	-0.197	3.84
BOE Career Objective	0.088	0.36
Other Career Objective	0.269	3.45

TABLE 8

SUMMARY TABLE FOR
THE ANALYSIS OF TEST SCORES

Analysis of Variance	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	3	L
Regression	4	247.63043	61.90761	3.264	.01
Residual	89	1687.77383	18.96375		

TABLE 9

BETA AND F SCORES FOR VARIABLES
CONTRIBUTING TO TYPING SPEED (C-WPM)

Variable	BETA	F
Grade	-0.2214	4.79
Semesters of Shorthand	0.3926	14.82
School 1	0.2368	5.31
School 2	0.1264	1.61
School 3	-0.851	0.54
School 4	0.2977	6.16
School 5	-0.0158	0.02
School 6	0.0503	0.23
School 7	-0.0206	0.34

TABLE 10

SUMMARY TABLE FOR
THE ANALYSIS OF TYPING SPEED (C-WPM)

Analysis of Variance	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	L
Regression	11	3676.29332	334.20848	4.507	.01
Residual	82	6080.18540	74.14860		

TABLE 11

SUMMARY TABLE FOR
THE ANALYSIS OF TYPING ERRORS

Analysis of Variance	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	
Regression	9	1055.62496	117.29166	1.93154	N.S.
Residual	84	5100.85376	60.72445		

Analysis of On-Site Review

CHAPTER IV

INTRODUCTION

Seven key schools were visited between March 20 and April 6, 1979, by Drs.Spooner, Donnel and Dierks. The following is a summary of the findings.

This Chapter addresses the following eight areas: Quality of Instruction, Facilities, Core Curriculum Component, Optional Curriculum, Administrative Support, Learning Activity Packets, Individualized Instruction, and Block Format. Each area is introduced with some general observations from the evaluator, and then specific ratings are provided on the Summary Judgment Sheet for that component. The standardsused in making the judgment's are from the model Key School Block Program.

Quality of Instruction

In general, the principals felt that the Key School Program had improved the quality of BOE instruction in their building over the past year. They felt that the teachers were working very hard, maybe too hard, in providing quality experiences for the students. The teachers were satisfied with the quality of instruction provided to the students. In general, teachers and students stated that it appeared the Block Format of instruction did not have an appreciable impact on students' attendance. It did,however,impact students'attitudes about their class: the teachers said the students were motivated and took more responsibility for their learning. The students felt they were receiving a quality education based upon the requirements in the want-ads

and their own perception of their abilities. The students also stated that the Program had made a difference in their attitude about their responsibilities concerning school. The students stated that the Program provided instruction that was practical and applied to what they wanted to do, and for the most part they felt the Program provided them with more fexibility to meet their own personal goals. The format for the Block was well organized and consistent with that recommended in the Key School Program. The following are the evaluators' ratings of Quality of Instruction:

I. Quality of Instruction

(Rating of 5.0):
(1) The principal questioned the quality of the BOE Block Program.
(5) The principal stated the students were receiving quality instruction.

(Rating of 5.0):
(1) The teacher feels the students are not receiving a quality education.
(5) The teacher stated the students were receiving instruction of superior quality to that received using the non-block format.

(Rating of 3.0):
(1) The Program has had a negative impact on student attendance.
(5) The Program has had a positive impact on student attendance.

(Rating of 5.0):
(1) The students feel they are not receiving quality instruction.
(5) The students feel they are receiving quality instruction.

Facilities

The criteria for judging facilities were adequate equipment and compatability of equipment to that used in a business setting.

The evaluators felt that the facilities were very adequate; the equipment was up-to-date, in good repair and generally of sufficient quantity, so all students had access to the equipment when needed. All programs had at lease two rooms; one set up as a model office and the other with typewriters in rows. Several programs had a third room used for copy equipment, storage, etc.

It was noted that in most programs the students were responsible for answering the school telephone; in many cases it rang into the classrooms. The students had ready access to equipment and did not have to wait any unreasonable amount of time to utilize any piece of equipment including duplicating and sophisticated typewriting equipment. It was established that the students had no problems getting adequate supplies for their instructional assignment, such as ribbons, paper, etc. It was felt that the teachers and administration were making progress in upgrading the equipment for the Business and Office Program. The following are the evaluators' ratings of the facilities in all seven key schools:

II. Facilities

(Rating of 4.0):	(1)	The room is a typical classroom.
	(5)	The room has an office-like atmosphere.
Rating of 4.0):	(1)	There are no model office work stations.
	(5)	There is a model office with enough work stations to use it for simulation.

(Rating of 5.0): (1) Supplies are generally not available to students.

(5) Students have access to adequate supplies.

(Rating of 5.0): (1) There is no storage for student material, supplies and equipment.

(5) There is adequate student supplies and equipment storage.

(Rating of 5.0): (1) Students could only use the equipment during class under the direct supervision of the teacher.

(5) Equipment was available to the student at all times during school hours.

(Rating of 4.0): (1) Students had to wait to use typewriters, calculators and other commonly used office equipment on a regular basis.

(5) There was sufficient equipment so students did not have to wait an unreasonable amount of time to use equipment.

(Rating of 4.0): (1) The equipment was out of date and in poor repair.

(5) The equipment available to the students was the same quality and condition as one might find in an office.

Core Components

A major component of the Program was the utilization of a core subject that emphasized an interrelated instructional strategy for various skills and knowledge necessary in business and office occupations. The core area is described on the following page.

First Year:

CORE SUBJECTS

Orientation
- Care of Machines
- Work Priority
- Materials Organization

Career Planning
Youth Organization--FBLA
Basic Typing (Review) TY2 100-113
Calculating/Business Machines
Telephone Techniques
Filing
Duplicating Processes
Mail Handling
Job Application & Interview
Listening
Introductory Data Processing
Reference Materials
Spelling/Grammer/Punctuation
Simulation Phase

Second Year:

CORE SUBJECTS

Orientation
Career Planning
Youth Organization--FBLA
Telephone Techniques
Banking
Petty Cash
Business Communications
Human Relations
Consumerism
Travel Arrangements
Job Application & Interview
Simulation/Co-op Phase

All of the Key School programs taught most of the core subjects. Three of the core areas, as described in the model Key School Core, that were not being taught in several programs were: 1) travel arrangements, 2) setting work priorities and 3) initiative.

It was identified that most programs had an Advisory Committee, but most of the committee members had not yet met this year. This was seen as an area of weakness in the programs. Teachers generally stated that because of a lack of time, the Advisory Committee was not fully utilized.

Most Programs had an active FBLA Chapter. The extent of activity varied from Program to Program. Overall, it was observed that the Key School Core Component had been implemented in all schools visited. The following are the evaluators' ratings for the Core Component:

III. Core Components

(Rating of 5.0): (1) The Program does not use a Core Curriculum.

(5) The Program has addressed all core areas suggested in the key school description.

(Rating of 2.0): (1) There is no Advisory Committee.

(5) The Program has an active Advisory Committee.

(rating of 4.0): (1) The Program has an FBLA chapter on paper, with fewer than 20% of the Business and Office Vocational students as dues-paying members.

(5) The Program has an active FBLA chapter with 80% of the Vocational Business students enrolled as FBLA members.

Optional Experience

The Key School Program was developed to provide students with a wider variety of options than would otherwise be offered in a small school. Among the options offered were:

Accounting
Advanced Calculating
Advanced Data Processing
Typing-Speed & Accuracy Development
Intermediate Typing
Advanced Typing
Refresher Typing
ABC Shorthand
Machine Transcription
Advanced Business English
Proofreading & Editing
Accounting 2
Legal Typing
Medical Typing
Real Estate
Insurance
Executive Secretary
Civil Service Training
Statistical Typing

All programs offered at least three options: shorthand, typing and accounting. These were not always offered as part of the Block. Some instructors preferred to teach shorthand and/or accounting in a large class setting. A few programs offered multiple options, including some of the specialized fields, such as Legal and Medical Secretary.

The option areas were not as well developed as was the Core Curriculum. This is an area where more effort is needed. Individualized material needs to be developed and teacher inservices provided in order to strengthen the options available to students through the Key School Program.

In most programs, the options were used as skill building experiences. In two programs, where options were limited, the instructors emphasized

skill building activities as part of the Core. The following are the evaluators' judgments.

IV. Optional Experiences

(Rating of 3.0)
(1) The students are not given individual options.
(5) The students are provided an opportunity to pursue at least five different options.

(Rating of 5.0)
(1) Options are skill maintenance instructional experiences.
(5) Options are skill building instructional experiences.

Administrative Support

It was apparent that the administration supported the BOE Block Program. In general, the program had grown in number of students over last year. In some cases, the school board was willing to put extra money into the program in order to have quality equipment and instruction. Release time was not provided to the teachers for the development of curriculum material, and it was a concern of some principals and teachers that the amount of work required to build the Program would eventually "burn out" the teacher.

The teachers were provided with substitute teaching assistance when they needed to go to key school meetings and other inservices pertaining to the Block Program. The teachers felt the inservices were very valuable.

The following are the evaluators' judgments pertaining to administrative support.

V. Administrative Support

(Rating of 4.0)
(1) The school administration does not financially support the BOE Block Program.
(5) The school administration has invested extra funds into the development of the BOE Block.

(Rating of 1.0)
(1) No release time is provided to develop materials for the Block Program.
(5) The BOE teacher receives release time to develop instructional material for the Block.

(Rating of 5.0)

(1) The BOE teachers were not allowed to attend key school meetings and inservices.

(5) Substitute teachers have been provided so the BOE teachers could attend all key school meetings and inservices.

(Rating of 4.0)

(1) The Vocational BOE teacher has to spend three or more hours a week doing non-vocational education-related activities.

(5) The Vocational BOE teacher was assigned only vocational-related assignments.

Learning Activity Packets

In reviewing fourteen of the thirty-four LAPs utilized by the programs, it was found that for the most part, they did not have a pre-test, performance objectives, or a self-test included. It did appear, however, that the LAPs were of appropriate reading level, were logical in sequence, had a variety of learning activities and included a post-test. Further, it was judged by the evaluators that the LAPs reviewed were applicable to a Vocational Business and Office Program. The LAPs reviewed had approximately 45% cognitive content, 50% skill content and 5% attitudinal content. It was found that the students really enjoyed the LAPs. They felt the LAPs were easy to follow, allowed them to go at their own pace, made them more responsible for their own learning and provided a learning format that let them focus upon areas of their interest. It was found that the basic Core was taught almost entirely through the LAP individualized instructional process. The basic Core LAPs were, in general, assigned by the teacher, whereas the optional areas were for the most part, chosen by the student. Many options were taught through the utilization of LAPs. The exceptions were Accounting and Shorthand. Some options offered through the LAPs were Intermediate Typing, Advanced Typing, Intermediate Accounting, Advanced Accounting and Data Processing. All in all, it appeared the key schools were making

effective use of the LAPs. Table Twelve provides a summary of the evaluators' review of the key school LAPs.

The following are the evaluators' judgments concerning the utilization of LAPs.

VI. Learning Activity Packets

(Rating of 2.0)	(1)	The LAPs were missing four or more of the above components.
	(5)	The LAPs conformed to the standard definition for Learning Activity Packets, in that they contained pre-test, performance objectives, logical sequence, variety of learning activities, self-test and post-test.
(Rating of 4.0)	(1)	All LAPs had Life Skill and Career Awareness Objectives.
	(5)	All LAPs applied to vocational objectives.
(Rating of 5.0)	(1)	Students did not like the LAPs.
	(5)	Students used LAPs and felt they were good.
(Rating of 5.0)	(1)	No LAPs were available in the basic Core areas.
	(5)	LAPs were available for all basic Core areas.
(Rating of 3.0)	(1)	LAPs were not available for options.
	(5)	LAPs were available for four or more options.

Individualized Instruction

The Program offered the opportunity for students to receive both independent and individualized instruction. The students received a basic Core of instruction through LAPs. Most students in most programs were assigned the same Core areas at the same time with deadlines set by the teachers. The students could select other options, such as, Typing, Shorthand and Accounting on an individualized basis. The programs did use some other types of instruc-

TABLE 12

REVIEW OF LEARNING ACTIVITY PACKETS

Key Schools	LAPs Applied to Program?	Post-test in LAPs?	Self-test in LAPs?	LAPs Sequenced Adequately?	LAPs include a variety of Lng. Acts.?	Pre-test in LAPs?	Objectives have Minimum Expectations Stated?
(Model)	100%	Yes	50%	Yes	Yes	No	No
School 1	50%	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
School 2	100%	Yes	50%	Yes	Yes	No	No
School 3	100%	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	50%	No
School 4	50%	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
School 5	100%	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
School 6	100%	Yes	50%	Yes	Yes	No	50%

tional strategies, such as practice sets, projects, etc. Several programs were scheduled to begin an office simulation before the end of the school year. In most programs, students were given an opportunity to get on-the-job experiences either through school projects, (i.e. school newspaper) or serving as teacher aides. Programs were either implementing or planning to implement a co-op program. A major drawback to the implementation of an individualized program was the lack of a strong student management system at many of the schools. It appeared, in some cases, that either the students were locked into a tight time schedule and were assigned content to be completed by a deadline, or they were provided with a laissez-faire treatment. The programs need to develop a strong student management system if individualized instruction is to remain the primary instructional format.

Below are the evaluators' ratingsof the extent of individualized instruction.

VII. Individualized Instruction

(Rating of 5.0)
(1) The students received all basic Core instruction in groups.
(5) The Program offered all components of the Core using individualized LAPs.

(Rating of 3.0)
(1) All students were working on the same Core and options.
(5) All students had an opportunity and were encouraged to progress at their own rate.

(Rating of 4.0)
(1) The students could select only one individualized option.
(5) The students could select Advanced Typing, Shorthand, Medical, Legal or Accounting on an individualized basis.

(Rating of 3.0)

(1) There are no uses of model office simulation or cooperative placement as instructional activities.

(5) The Program uses model office simulation projects and cooperative placements to supplement the Block Program.

(1) The students were not provided a structured system for managing their program and couldn't choose curriculum units.

(Rating of 3.0)

(5) The students were provided with a management system that allowed them to work at their own pace and choose curriculum units to meet their needs.

Block Format

The model for the Block Format was two consecutively scheduled periods where students generally utilized one period for Core Curriculum studies, and the second for study in an option area.

The evaluators observed that there were several adaptations to the model format. The two larger programs had two, two-period blocks. One school had a three-period block, and three schools used a flexible-scheduling block format that had students meet together for one period during the day. The same students then scheduled any other period as the second part of the "Block".

Each instructor felt she had implemented the model Block Format. It is the observation of the evalutors, that the Block Format was a flexible-scheduling device that allowed students to take the curriculum content generally offered in a traditional office practice course on an individualized basis. The teachers felt the Block Format afforded them the opportunity to use learning activities that would not fit well into a one-period class. The teachers/students/administrators felt the Block, however defined, did not present scheduling problems. Teachers using the two or more consecutive periods format felt it provided the time to do simulations, practical experience and practice sets that need more than a one-period class.

V11. The following is the evaluated judgements concerning the Block Format.

(Rating of 3.0)

(1) No requirement to take two or more hours of Business courses.

(5) Two or more consecutive hours of instruction.

(Rating of 5.0)

(1) Problem with scheduling as seen by two or more of the following groups: Teachers, students and administrators.

(5) No problem seen in scheduling by teachers, students, or administrators.

Concluding Comments

Overall, the on-site reviews substantiated the fact that the individualized Block Program could be effectively utilized in a small rural school. It was felt that because of the low number of students involved some of the group activities suggested as part of the Key School concept, would not necessarily be beneficial. In particular, the use of simulation in a class of less than six students does not seem to be a practical kind of an experience. Also, there is some concern about cooperative education in conjunction with the Block Program in a small rural town because of the lack of training stations.

Students were instructed primarily with the utilization of Learning Activities Packets (LAPS). There were some students that had completed over one-hundred LAPS this year. The LAPS were both in the Core and options areas. LAPS were selected either by the teacher assigning a particular activity (generally in the Core area) or by the students choosing an option to pursue. Students felt that the LAPS were very good. One second-year student felt that some of the LAPS were presented at a level below her capabilities. She felt that as a second-year student, the LAPS needed to assume that she knew something about the subject matter. In two programs, students felt the LAPS allowed them to progress at their

own rate. However, there was a fixed rate of expectation by the teacher for each student. This rate was not the same for every student. Some students were expected to progress faster than others. The teachers monitored each student's progress; she set weekly goals and expectations for completed work. The students felt the weekly planning at a set rate of expectation was good and they depended upon it to pace their efforts.

The students were asked how they were graded. Most were not sure. They felt they were graded on their performance on the LAPS, timed typing, and tests. There was some mention of neatness of work area, promptness and other general criteria. Few of the students could pinpoint the actual process utilized in determining their grades.

In trying to determine if block scheduling effected attendance in any way, the evaluators found generally that students' attendance was the same this year as it was last year. The primary motivator for attendance appeared to be parents' concern about the students and students' interest in school.

All students felt that the instruction they received would be benefical to them as they sought employment in the area of business or office jobs. Further, the students felt the instructional techniques used were more flexible than those generally used in a classroom setting. It was pointed out to the evaluator that the teacher had more time to spend with students individually because of the LAP type of format. Futhermore, the instructional strategy did allow the students more freedom to schedule their own learning.

Students, teachers and administrators were supportive of the Program. All schools reviewed, intended to maintain the Block Format and use of individualized material.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In order to aid the reader, Tables 13 and 14 summarize the observations of the evaluator.

The initial evaluation design suggested several questions on which the investigation should focus. The following summary addresses the major evaluation questions considered in the study and will be the means for concluding about the B.O.E. Block Program.

To what extent has the Program provided a model office?

There was a model office provided at most schools, however, the students did not utilize them (the model offices) to the fullest extent. Some model offices also lacked furnishings and other amenties that would enhance the atmosphere of the office.

To what extent is adequate equipment available?

It was found that adequate equipment was available in all schools.

To what extent is the equipment utilized?

It appeared that the equipment available was well utilized. In some cases, the mimeograph and ditto copying machines were used in preparing a student newspaper. The Block students in some programs were also responsible for providing secretarial assistance to the building teachers. The dictating equipment was used by students in the steno-transcriber option. The typewriters and other equipment were used by students both during class and during whatever free time they might have.

Table 13

Program Evaluation Summary

Key=(5=high 1=low)	Model	School 1	School 2	School 3	School 4	School 5	School 6
ADEQUACY OF STUDENT EVALUATION?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
SCHEDULING PROBLEMS?	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
STUDENT/TEACHER	14/1	8/1	28/1	8/1	4/1	11/1	10/1
TEACHER(S) ACTIVITY WITH FBLA?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
TEACHER(S) ACTIVITY WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEE?	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
EXTENT OF PROGRAM EFFECT ON STUDENT BEHAVIOR?	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
RELEASE TIME PROVIDED FOR MATERIAL DEVELOPMENT?	YES 1st yr only	YES 1st yr only	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
EFFECT ON STUDENT ATTENDANCE?	NO	N/A	NO	NO	N/A	NO	NONE
PEER INSTRUCTION?	YES	YES	YES	NO	limited	YES	limited
PEER APPRAISAL SYSTEM?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
DO STUDENTS UNDERSTAND GRADING (EVALUATION)?	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
ARE STUDENTS MOTIVATED TO LEARN?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
COMPATABILITY OF STUDENTS' CAREER OBJECTIVES TO PROGRAM GOALS?	60%	60%	60%	83%	75%	90%	80%

TABLE 14

REVIEW OF PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

MODEL PROGRAM	School 1	School 2	School 3	School 4	School 5	Model	School 6
2 PERIOD BLOCK		x	x		x	x	
2 Blocks	No	x	No	No	x	x	No
LAPs for Core Areas	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
LAPs for Options	x	x	x	Working on thes	No Short-hand x	x	Yes Lim. Use
Student Time Management	No	No	x	Optional	x	x	x aide not work
Instructional/Career Plans	x	No	x	x	x	x	x not used
Independent Study	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Individualized Inst.	No	x	For op-tions only	All ex-cept Shorthand	All ex-cept Shorthand	x	No
Group Study/Inst.		Shorthand		Shorthand	Shorthand	Some core areas	Acct/ Typing
Core Skill Development	Typing	Typing	Typing	Typing	Calc.	Typing Cal.	Typing Cal.
Group Projects	x	No	No	No	?	No	No
Telephone - In Classroom	x	No	Tele-Receiver		x	x	x
Uses Co-op	No	Possible	Fall 79	Possible	In Schl Bldg only	Yes	x
Uses Simulation	No	No	x	No	x	Yes	No
Lab. Time Available to Students	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

MODEL PROGRAM	School 1	School 2	School 3	School 4	School 5	Model	School 6
Model Office		x	x	One Station	x	x	x
Accounting Option	?	x	x	No	x	x	Class
Typing II Option	x	x	x	x Lapped	x	x	Class
Steno Option	x	Class	x	Class	Class	x	Class
Prerequisites (First yr Typing)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Students Have Stated Career Objectives	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Quality and Quantity Instructional Materials a) types b) availability	?	4	3	3	5	5	5
Quality and Quantity Equipment	4	4	4	4	4	5	
Availability of Equip.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Extent of Student Practice: Typing	4	4	4	4	4	4	
Extent of Student Practice: Calc.	4	4	4	4	2		4
Suff. Storage for Students	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Suff. Work Space for Stud.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Limited
Supp-Accessible/Available?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Adequate Reference Materials?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Office-Like Atmosphere?	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes

To what extent was the site visit to a model school helpful?

When asked, the teachers felt that the visit to the model Program at Elizabeth High School and the inservice meetings attended were both quite helpful. The principals of the schools, when asked about the types of resources provided and the extent of help given, responded that this year the State Board Supervisors were quite helpful.

What do the students think about the Program?

The students, for the most part, enjoyed the Block Program as described earlier. They felt the instruction provided for their own growth and gave them an opportunity to reach out on their own. Further, the flexibility of the structure was such that they could plan their work around other kinds of activities. The students stated that the teacher was available to answer questions and provide individualized assistance. All students liked their teachers.

Are there scheduling problems?

From all points of view, it appeared that scheduling was not a problem. The principals, students and teachers felt that the students were able to schedule business and office education into their program with ease. The point was made that because of the block scheduling, as described earlier, the students who may not have taken business and office programs are now enrolled. Many programs experienced an increase in enrollment.

Are there time problems?

It was observed that the only individuals having time problems were the teachers. The teachers spend much more time developing the new program than they otherwise would have in the traditional classroom setting.

Do students receive quality instruction?

Key school students scored as well on the performance test as the control group students. Seniors in the key school out performed the control group seniors on the typing speed test. There was no statistically significant difference in the number of typing errors made by the key school students versus the control group students. Students, teachers and administration felt the Program offered quality instruction.

Summary

Tables 13 and 14 summarize the evaluators' judgments concerning the seven schools reviewed.

The students, teachers, and administrators were very positive toward the Program and see it as a means of providing more options to students in small rural schools. Further, the Block Format provided more flexibility in scheduling and gave teachers more latitude in the types of learning activities assigned.

Other significant finds are that students liked the independent learning materials, and seemed to be highly motivated. The teachers felt that because of the Program, student enrollment in B.O.E. had increased.

The evaluation team felt the Program has great potential for both small and large schools. It is recommended that further development, testing and evaluation be done in order to refine materials and procedures.

Appendix A

Instruments

Business and Office

Graduate Follow-up

Directions: Please respond to each question as completely as possible. Feel free to add any comments.

1) To what extent did your Business and Office High School Program prepare you for the following areas and to what extent do you perform each task?

AREAS	EXTENT THE PROGRAM PREPARED ME FOR EACH AREA					EXTENT I HAVE USED SKILLS I DEVELOPED IN EACH AREA				
	Poor		Aver.		Excel.	Low		Med.		High
a) Typing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
b) Telephone techniques	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
c) Calculating	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
d) Filing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
e) Duplicating processes	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
f) Mail handling	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
g) Listening	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
h) Data processing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
i) Spelling	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
j) Grammar / punctuation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
k) Proofreading	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
l) Human relations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
m) Travel arrangements	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
n) Business communications	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
o) Job application / interview	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
p) Set work priorities	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
q) Orgznize work flow	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
r) Care for equipment	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
s) Initiative	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

2) Are you employed in an area related to your career objective? Yes__ No__

3) How many employees are there in your office? _____

4) Do you get along well with others in your office? Yes__ No__

5) How many days did you miss work last month? _____

6) Do you see this job as a career position? Yes__ No__

7) Have you received a promotion since being employed? Yes__ No__

8) How long have you been employed in your present position? _____

9) Do you see the LAPs or units of instruction used in your BOE Program as being:

a) appropriate Yes___ No___
b) accurate Yes___ No___
c) valuable Yes___ No___
d) effective Yes___ No___
e) other _____

Why or why not? _____

10) What was the most important LAP or unit of instruction covered in the BOE Block Program? Why?

_____

_____

_____

11) What was the least important LAP or unit covered in the BOE Block Program? Why?

_____

_____

_____

12) List your current employer's name and mailing address:

_____
Name

_____
Company Name

_____
Street

_____
City State Zip

Business and Office

Employer Survey

DIRECTION: Would you please complete the following questions concerning _____ (Employee's Name). Your responses will be held in confidence.

1) Is this individual still employed? Yes___ No___

If No: What was the reason for termination? _____

_____

2) To what extent does the employee perform in the following areas and what is his/her proficiency?

AREAS	EXTENT WORK IN THE AREA IS PART OF EMPLOYEE'S RESPONSIBILITY					EXTENT OF EMPLOYEE'S PROFICIENCY				
	None				High	None				High
a) Typing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
b) Telephone techniques	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
c) Calculating	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
d) Filing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
e) Duplicating	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
f) Mail handling	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
g) Listening	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
h) Data processing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
i) Spelling	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
j) Grammar / punctuation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
k) Proofreading	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
l) Human relations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
m) Travel arrangements	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
n) Business communications	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
o) Job application / interviews	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
p) Set work priorities	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
q) Organize work flow	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
r) Care for equipment	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
s) Initiative	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

3) If positions were available, would you employ other graduates from a Vocational Business and Office Education Program? Yes_____No_____
Comments:_____

_____

_____

4) Does this employee have a good attendance/punctuality record? Yes____No____
Comments:_____

_____

_____

5) Does this employee work cooperatively with others? Yes_____No _____
Comments: _____

_____

_____

6) From your point of view, how well was the employee prepared for entry level employment?_____

_____

_____

7) In what area(s) did this employee lack training? _____

_____

_____

GRADUATE INFORMATION SHEET

Graduate's Name	Permanent Mailing Address	Place of Employment	Employer's Name	Did or Will You Schedule An Interview With			
				Graduate		Employer	
				Yes	No	Yes	No

STUDENT INFORMATION SHEET

Student's Name	Permanent Mailing Address	Block Voc. Program Yes No	Grade Level	Sex M F	Career Objectives	# of Sem./Qtr./Hr. of Shorthand Comp.	# of Sem. of Typing Comp.	# of Sem. of Acct. Comp.	Option to be Tested		
									Acct.	Sec.	Cler.

Business and Office
Student Interview Form

School_____ Name_____

1) What is your occupational goal?_____

2) What business courses have you taken while in high school prior to this year?

(How many semesters)	# of Semesters
a) Typing	1 2 3 4 5 6
b) Shorthand	1 2 3 4 5 6
c) Bookkeeping/accounting	1 2 3 4 5 6
d) Office practice	1 2 3 4 5 6
e) Others_____	1 2 3 4 5 6

3) Did you have any problems scheduling your Business and Office Block Program this year? [If yes, ask] What problems?_____

_____

_____

_____

4) What equipment are you trained to use?_____

_____

_____

5) Is there equipment you use that is not located in the BOE Laboratory? [If yes, ask] What equipment and where is it located?_____

_____

_____

6) Are there any restrictions on your use of equipment while you are in the Block Class? [If yes, ask] What are they?_____

_____

_____

7) Do you have to wait to use equipment?_____[If yes, ask] What equipment?_____How long must you wait?_____

_____How often do you have to wait?_____

8) How much time did you spend practicing in the past month on the following types of equipment?

Equipment	Within Block Class Time	Outside of Block Class
Typewriter Calculator/Adding Machines Memory Typewriter Copying Machines Others _____ Specify		

9) When can you use the classroom for practice and study, other than class time?

_____

_____

10) Do you have problems getting supplies that are needed to complete your work assignments? paper, ribbons, packets?_____[If yes, ask] Would you describe them for me?_____

_____

_____

11) How many LAPs have you completed?_____

_____

12) What do you think of LAPs?_____

_____

13) How are LAPs assigned?_____

_____

_____

14) Are you encouraged to progress at your own rate?_____

_____

15) How are you graded?_____

_____

16) How many scheduled school days of class have you missed?_____
(last full month)

17) How does this compare to your attendance last year?_____

[If different, ask] Why?_____

_____

18) What made you decide to enroll in Vocational BOE?_____

_____

19) Are you an active member of FBLA?_____

20) What FBLA activities do you have in class? (e.g. leadership, parlimentary procedures, meeting in class, etc.)_____

_____

21) Do you feel you are receiving adequate instruction for employment in a business and office occupation?_____

22) Do you receive instruction that encourages you to work with other students in a cooperative manner? [If yes, ask] What types of experiences?

_____

_____

23) How would you compare the types of instructional activities experienced in the BOE Program to the instructional activities experienced in other classes?_____

_____

24) Do you feel you are receiving quality instruction? Why or Why not?_____

_____

_____

25) Do you have a learning plan?_____

_____

_____

BOE Evaluation
Program Checklist

# of Students_____ School_____

#	Equip. * Type	Condition Exc.. Poor	Location	Comments
	Electric Typewriter	1 2 3 4 5		
	Manual Typewriter	1 2 3 4 5		
	Calculators	1 2 3 4 5		
	Adding Machine	1 2 3 4 5		
	Copiers	1 2 3 4 5		
	Dictating Units	1 2 3 4 5		
	Transcribers	1 2 3 4 5		
	Memory Type-writer	1 2 3 4 5		
	Ditto	1 2 3 4 5		
	Mimeograph	1 2 3 4 5		
	Desk	1 2 3 4 5		
	Chairs	1 2 3 4 5		
	Work Tables	1 2 3 4 5		
	AVT	1 2 3 4 5		
	Accessories	1 2 3 4 5		

* ask teacher if there is other equipment.

Describe the amount of work space._____

Supplies Inventory

Amount	Kind		Amount	Kind

List amount and kind of reference material available._____

_____

_____

Judge the office-like atmosphere. (Arrangement of space, students' behavior etc. . .)_____

_____

_____

Identify the types of individualized training material._____

_____

_____

Describe the storage for:

Individualized materials_____

_____

Other instructional material_____

_____

_____

_____

Equipment _____

_____

Student material _____

_____

Business and Office Education

Teacher Survey

Teacher_____ School_____

Which of the following tasksdid you teach this year?

Task	Did Teach	Will Teach
a) Typing		
b) Telephone techniques		
c) Calculating		
d) Filing		
e) Duplicating processes		
f) Mail handling		
g) Listening		
h) Data processing		
i) Spelling		
j) Grammar/punctuation		
k) Proofreading		
l) Human relations		
m) Travel arrangements		
n) Business communications		
o) Job application/interviews		
p) Set work priorities		
q) Organize work flow		
r) Care for equipment		
s) Initiative		

2) Do you have enough equipment for all students? If NO, what equipment is needed?_____

_____

_____

3) Is there other equipment used by the Voc BOE students not housed in the laboratory? If YES, what and where? _____

_____

_____

4) Have you had problems getting adequate equipment?_____

_____

5) Is there equipment needed for the Block Program that generally is not available in the traditional program? If YES, what kinds?

_____

_____

_____

6) Do you have laboratory time scheduled for individuals to practice and do independent work? _____

_____

_____

7) What LAP's are available to students? Get list or:

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Evaluator will review two LAP's picked at random.

LAP Review Criteria	LAP 1	LAP 2
Pre-test		
Performance objectives		
Reading level		
Logical sequence		
Variety of learning activities		
Self-test		
Post-test, performanced based		
Apply to BOE		
(Vocational concepts vs. content)		
% Cognitive		
% Skills		
% Attitudinal		

Other Comments _____

8) How are students evaluated?

Check if Used	Criteria	Comments
_____	Production test	_____
_____	Job performance test	_____
_____	Check list	_____
_____	Rating scales	_____
_____	Attitude measures	_____
_____	Standardized test	_____
_____	Teacher made test	_____
_____	Others	_____

9) What is your class schedule for the Vocational Block Program?

_____

_____

10) Have you had any problems in scheduling for the Block Program?_____

_____

_____

_____

11) What is the student/teacher ratio in the Block?_____

12) Do you have a teacher aide? If YES,how is he/she used?_____

_____

13) What other responsibilities do you have in other phases of the Vocational Educational Program? (e.g. student org., career advisement, Advisory Committees)_____

_____

_____

14) What non-vocational education responsibilities do you have?_____

_____

_____

15) Have you been provided with released time to develop material for the Program?_____

_____

16) To what extent, do you feel you have received administrative support for the Block Program?_____

_____

_____

_____

17) Has the school provided substitute teachers so that you may attend the meetings related to the Block Program? _____

_____

18) Since implementing the Block Program, have you observed any change in students' attendance patterns? If YES, ask what?_____

_____

_____

_____

19) Have you noticed any change in students' behavior due to the Block type of instruction? If YES, ask what?_____

_____

_____

_____

20) Since implementing the Program have you observed any changes in student attitudes?_____

_____

21) Do you use peer instruction or peer appraisal systems? If YES, describe._____

_____

_____

22) Do you provide individualized instruction? If YES, describe. (Independent study vs. Individualized instruction)_____

_____

_____

23) Are students at different proficiency levels in the curriculum?

24) How are students recruited for the BOE Block?

25) How are students screened for the BOE Block?

26) What are the prerequisites for the Block?

27) What services do the counselors provide to the BOE Vocational Program?

28) Do you have an individualized learning plan for each student? [Do students like learning plans?]

29) Do you feel the Block Program provides a structure which facilitates instruction?

30) Do you use model office simulation, projects, co-op or a combination of activities to supplement the Block Program?_____

_____

_____

_____

31) How are you using your Advisory Committee?_____

How many times have they met?_____

_____

_____

Vocational Business and Office:
Administrator Survey

1) What are your impressions of the Vocational Business and Office Vocational Education Program?_____

2) To what extent have you been informed about the new Vocational Business and Office Block Program? By whom?_____

3) Do you feel the Block Program provides a format for quality instruction?_____

4) What type of input, about the Block Vocation BOE Program, have you received from students, parents, other teachers, employers or Advisory Committee members?_____

5) Has the school provided additional resources for the Business and Office Program? (e.g. funds, teacher aides, materials) (If yes, what type?)_____

6) What are your perceptions of the support your school has received in implementing the Business and Office Education Block Program from, SBCCOE, other schools, others?_____

7) Has scheduling been a concern?_____

8) Has the program been able to generate adequate student/teacher ratio?_____

_____

Code Graduate
/ /
Employer School

Business and Office:
Employer Survey

Directions: Would you please complete the following questions concerning

_____ Your responses will be
(Employee's Name)
held in confidence.

---

1) Is this individual still employed? Yes _____ No _____

If No: what was the reason for termination? _____

_____

2) To what extent does the employee perform in the following areas and what is his/her proficiency?

AREA	Extent the work in the AREA is part of employee's responsibility					Extent of employees' proficiency				
	None				High	None				High
a) Typing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
b) Telephone techniques	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
c) Calculating	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
d) Filing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
e) Duplicating	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
f) Mail handling	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
g) Listening	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
h) Data processing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
i) Spelling	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
j) Grammar/punctuation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
k) Proofreading	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
l) Human relations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
m) Travel arrangements	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
n) Business communications	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
o) Job application interviews	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
p) Set work priorities	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
q) Organize work flow	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
r) Care for equipment	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
s) Initiative	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

3) If positions were available, would you employ other graduates from a Vocational Business and Office Education Program? Yes____No____
Comments: _____

_____

_____

4) Does this employee have a good attendance/punctuality record? Yes___No___
Comments: _____

_____

_____

5) Does this employee work cooperatively with others? Yes___No___
Comments: _____

_____

_____

6) From your point of view, how well was the employee prepared for entry level employment? _____

_____

_____

7) In what area(s) did this employee lack training? _____

_____

_____